



**NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY
CENTRAL SECURITY SERVICE**
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND 20755

NSA review
completed

29 March 1977

25X1 MEMORANDUM FOR MR. [REDACTED] DIRECTOR OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
AND IMPROVEMENT, INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

25X1

SUBJECT: Issues for SCC Subcommittee on PRM-11, Task 2

1. We have hastily reviewed your issues paper. The time available did not allow for development of an institutional view in even the most rudimentary sense. Accordingly, the remarks attached are a reflection of my personal assessment and my best understanding of what I believe NSA may think about some of this when it has the chance to do so. I do hope that we will be able to proceed in a somewhat more deliberate fashion in the subsequent stages of this exercise.

2. Rather than try to comment on the details of your paper, we have restricted our remarks to suggesting an additional opinion; and a companion option, to Issue No. One. We have not attempted a review of the other issues, or even an opinion as to their validity, but would hope to have the opportunity to do so in the course of future working group activities.

3. Finally, one more general comment: the remark on page 3 alluding to a lack of responsiveness in the SICINT area strikes me as being both misleading and singularly inappropriate for a paper of this nature. I suggest it be deleted.

25X1

[REDACTED]
Assistant Director, NSA/CSS
for
Policy and Liaison

Incl:
NSA Comments

Copy Furnished:
NCRDEF

25X1

SECRET

NSA COMMENTS

Issue No. 1. Possible Conclusions.

Suggest adding a fourth opinion to reflect more specifically a mechanism which would apply to NSA and possibly to other Defense assets. This opinion would serve to delineate the role of DCI as the stater of requirements and priorities and the SECDEF as the programming and budgeting authority for these assets. This opinion could read as follows:

"Opinion 4: The DCI should exercise his community 'management' responsibilities through the authoritative statement of priorities and requirements and through taking the lead in the area of community planning. Routine programming and budgeting responsibilities should remain, in the case of Defense Department assets, with the SECDEF with the DCI interacting and influencing major issues through the PRC(I) mechanism. The DCI does not require line authority and/or budget control over elements of the community (other than CIA) in order to discharge his responsibilities."

Issue No. 1, page 6.

Suggest following variant to Opinion 1:

"1. Essential status quo of community structure as described in E.O. 11905, with reaffirmation of authoritative DCI role in stating requirements and priorities and in overall management of the NFIP through the PRC(I) mechanism."

Reason: To conform to the additional "opinion" recommended above.

25X1

SECRET